

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3, and 7-21 are now pending in the application. Claims 2 and 4-6 have been cancelled, without prejudice. Claims 9-21 have been withdrawn from consideration. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **OBJECTION As To INFORMALITIES**

Claim 1 stands objected to because of the following informalities: The limitation reciting "that the electroluminescent layer is curved in section" is not very clear. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicant has deleted the term "in section" from claim 1, thereby rendering this objection moot.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102; DUINEVELD**

Claim 1, 3, 4, 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Duineveld et al. (U.S. Pat. App. No. 2002/0060518). Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Urabe et al. (U.S. Pat. App. No. 2003/0107314). Claim 1, 3-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (U.S. Pat. App. No. 2003/0098645). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 now recites features from each of dependent Claims 4, 5 and 6. Applicants respectfully assert that the cited documents, either singly or in

combination, provide no disclosure or suggestion of an electroluminescent display having the combination of features recited in independent Claim 1.


Since each of the remaining claims depends, either directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that the dependent claims are likewise patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 5, 2006

By:   
Michael E. Hilton  
Reg. No. 33,509

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MEH/jlk